

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The final Office Action dated October 23, 2006, has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 13-22 are rejected by the Examiner. Claims 13 and 17-20 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-22 remain pending in this application with claims 1-12 having been withdrawn.

In the Office Action, the previous amendment filed August 2, 2006 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. § 132(a) as allegedly introducing new matter into the disclosure. Claims 13-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 13-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2004/0114094 to Kim et al. (hereinafter "Kim"). Claims 13 and 15-21 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 19 and 23 of the co-pending application 10/701,489.

The rejection to claims 13-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

The Examiner rejects claims 13-22 as reciting the limitation "rotating the table," alleging that the limitation was not disclosed in the original specification. Claims 13 and 17-20 have been amended to remove the limitation cited by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 13-22 fully comply with the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, and respectfully requests that the objection be withdrawn.

The Examiner objects to Applicant's August 2, 2006 amendment as introducing new matter into the specification. In particular, the Examiner objects to the amendment to the claims to recite "rotating the table." As Applicant has discussed above, claims 13 and 17-20 have been amended to remove the limitation "rotating the table." Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to the Applicant's August 2, 2006 amendment be withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 13-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kim is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Applicant submits that Kim does not disclose inherently or implicitly teach each and every element of the claims.

Claims 13-22 each recite a dispensing method for a liquid crystal display panel having a combination of elements including "rotating a plate on the table to rotate the substrate on the

table.” Applicant submits that Kim does not disclose at least this element. For example, the Examiner cites FIGs. 9A-9B of Kim as disclosing “overturning (e.g. rotating to vertically align) the table 810.” Applicant submits that “overturning the table” is not the same as “rotating a plate on the table to rotate the substrate on the table” as recited by the claims and that no portion of Kim, including the portions referenced by the Examiner, discloses the above-identified element of claims 13-22. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Kim does not anticipate claims 13-22.

Claims 13 and 15-21 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 19 and 23 of the co-pending application 10/701,489. Applicant disagrees with the Examiner’s assertions. Because the claims of the present application are not yet in their final form, Applicant believes that a Terminal Disclaimer would be premature at this time. After the remaining rejections have been resolved, Applicant will consider filing a Terminal Disclaimer in order to expedite prosecution of the instant application.

Applicant believes the foregoing amendments and remarks place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. *A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.*

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 12, 2007

By Valerie P. Hayes ^{Reg. No. 53,005}
for Rebecca G. Rudich
Registration No. 41,786
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant